



MY COUGH.

Normandy Farm, 30. April, 1834.

DANIEL, in his "RURAL SPORTS," tells us of a gentleman who was very skillful, and very particular, in hunting his *harriers*. When the dogs are at fault, or trailing, it is of great consequence that no voice but that of the huntsman is heard; and, especially, that no sudden exclamation or noise take place; for, the dogs, eager to start the game, or to discover the right direction in which it is gone, lift up their heads, look about, and hope that their trouble is over. This puts a stop to their diligent search; and, indeed, is a great hinderance to their pursuit, and to the sport of the day. DANIEL, as an instance of the rigidity of the gentleman before-mentioned, tells us, that, one day, when the *harriers* were busily trailing, a gentleman amongst the *harriers* in the field, was taken with a very violent coughing; whereupon the owner of the *harriers* rode up to him in great haste, and with angry countenance, saying, "Sir! I wish your cough was better!" "I wish so, too," replied the other, "and your *temper* along with it."

Now amongst the innumerable persons who do me the honour to make inquiries relative to the state of my health, the tone of some certainly does much resemble that of the owner of the *harriers* above-mentioned. What! not enough to have the bodily ailment; and, added to that, the intolerable mortification at being compelled to be absent from my duty in Parliament at this time; are not these

enough, without being subjected to something very much bordering on reproach for my absence? Such persons are not only very unreasonable; but they discover a *want of feeling*. They tell me at the same time, how grateful they are to me for the knowledge that I have communicated to them; and for the great good which they think I have done for the country; their only feeling, therefore, ought to be sorrow for the bodily sufferings which I now have, and anxiety for my complete re-establishment; and they ought to press me by all means, not to attempt to resume my labours in Parliament, nor even to think of it, until I find that my strength is fully and completely restored; and this, indeed, is the advice which I shall most assuredly follow.

My state, at present, is this: my cough is gradually leaving me; but I have to suffer a degree of lassitude and want of appetite, more difficult to get rid of than the cough. I think, however, that that is beginning to go. I have been able to-day to think about dining upon a sucking-pig on Sunday next; and to think about it without loathing. I have tried very nice young chickens, very nicely roasted; and though I ate of them, it has been without relish. The only meat that I eat with anything worthy of being called an appetite, is a rasher of bacon, all fat, toasted before the fire, and laid upon a thin bit of bread. Five or six times a day I have half a pint of very nicely made beef-tea, which has been the main-stay. Upon the whole, I think I am much better, and I feel stronger than four days ago.

It is a very curious thing that I have not had the smallest degree of *headack*; and, indeed, I cannot recollect the day when I had; it would seem as if this top part of me were wholly disconnected with all the rest. If I had not been in Parliament nobody but those immediately about me would ever have heard

of my being ill. Being there, the fact was obliged to be stated by myself; and, indeed, it was necessary that it should be stated. According to present appearances my recovery will go gradually on; but upon one thing I am determined; and that is, not to return to London till my strength be completely restored; and this is the advice of my doctors, as well as of the best and truest of my friends.

CHEAP DEFENCE OF NATIONS.

WHEN the French republicans had abolished nobility, and all orders giving men rank above their fellow-citizens, the old hired and pensioned hack, BURKE, spoke of it as a thing very *foolish*, seeing that titles and honours cost nothing; and he therefore called them the "*cheap defence of nations*," representing them as a reward for military and other public services.

This nation, as well as the French, knew this to be an impudent lie; for they had always seen that money followed the title. They had seen men elevated to the peerage for what were called "*brilliant services*"; but they had always seen pensions or grants attached to the title. They had seen, in fact, that it was much more an affair of money than of honour; and that it was the *dearest* defence, the most costly defence, that a nation could possibly obtain. They knew BURKE to be an impudent liar; and they saw him get two enormous pensions for telling a lie, which pensions he secured to his executors, and which pensions we are paying to this day.

But, as if for the purpose of banishing this lie completely from the minds of men, we are now, it seems, actually to pay some money on account of the mere act of giving a title to those innumerable swarms of men who are called "*Knights of the Bath*." Let me, before I go further, insert the King's message to the House of Commons, delivered to the House about ten days ago:

"His Majesty acquaints the House of

Commons, that having taken into his consideration the present state of the Most Honourable Military Order of the Bath, he deems it proper that measures should be taken for regulating and limiting the number of the members of the several classes, as well as for the purpose of relieving persons upon whom in future this distinction shall be conferred, from the payment of fees and charges, as authorised by the existing standards and regulations. His Majesty makes this communication in the perfect confidence that his faithful Commons will direct due inquiries to be instituted as to the losses to be sustained by the respective officers interested in the fees, and enable his Majesty to award to them such COMPENSATION as may be judged expedient."

Thus, then, when a man who has been strutting about in fine clothes, and receiving pay for a dozen years out of the public money; and has got half-pay for life, and a pension secured for his wife, wants a title; that title is to be made out for him by a person who has been accustomed to be paid for it; and, instead of his paying for the title himself, the people are now to pay for it: the malt of the labourer is to be taxed to pay for a few words written to make this fellow a "*sir*," and his wife a "*lady*"! One would think that this had been done for the express purpose of seeing how far this people were capable of yielding. It is the grossest thing ever attempted to be done within my recollection: to make the people pay for the titles given to these fellows and their wives!

For my part, I think I personally know; that is to say, am personally acquainted with, about three or four of these *Knights of the Bath*. I never will be personally acquainted with another, beyond those four; and I never will have any communication with them, verbal or written. I shall consider each of them as taking from me some portion of my earnings; and I will have no more to do with them than I would have to do with persons belonging to the Bourbon-like police. Others may do as

they please in this respect ; but, for my part, I will have nothing to do with "*sirs*" and "*ladies*," whose title of nobility I have been compelled to help to pay for. The sum, in this case, may be comparatively small ; but the principle is great. It seems to me that any thing so directly offensive to every principle of justice never was heard of before. It is too palpable not to be seen by every one ; and one would hope that it must produce a suitable effect.

CHURCH AFFAIRS.

It is surprising that the Ministers should entertain the hope of propping up the "*church and state*" any longer. Whether we look at their tithe-scheme, at their church-rate scheme, at their marriage act, at their university scheme, we find all in the same character : an attempt every where to cajole the Dissenters ; and an attempt nowhere to grant their claims. There is an apparent yielding ; but, in fact, no yielding at all. What I have disliked in all these measures, is, the insincerity every where visible. The Dissenters themselves will find, at last, that they must come to the grand point : *a total separation of church and state*. Short of this they will gain nothing. Here all is fair : all is understood ; there is sense in every argument. It is very curious that this was the very principle for which Sir THOMAS MORE and Bishop FISHER died on the scaffold ; a principle, therefore, sealed with the blood of two of the most virtuous men that ever lived.

FISHER, in his celebrated remonstrance to Henry the Eighth, told him, that it was contrary to every principle of Christianity ; that it was impossible that a church could be believed in, if the head of the church were the head of the state ; that it was something too monstrous to call upon to believe that a little girl, or a little boy, (for such might be the sovereign) was the head of CHRIST's church ; that a baby in arms ; a frail little thing cut-

ting its teeth, could be sanctioned by CHRIST as the head of his church.

This feeling of abhorrence for so monstrous a thing has always been in existence from that day to this ; and that which the Dissenters now say, has been always said by all men of sense and sincerity.

The evils and oppressions which have arisen out of this union of church and state, have been borne for three hundred years ; but always borne with great grudging and great impatience. In the meanwhile nothing has been proposed to be done to give satisfaction to the Dissenters. They are still to pay church-rates as much as the church-people : they are still to pay tithes : they are, in fact, still to be excluded from the universities. In their marriage act there is no justice ; and the hope seems to have been, to cajole them to a non-resistance for another year, and to take the chances of their desisting from their demands.

That man must be blind, absolutely blind, who does not see that this church, if not taken quietly to pieces, will excite a struggle of the most violent description, which may involve every creature in the community. What is the miserable measure about tithes, leaving the bishopricks, and leaving the deans and chapters, and leaving the colleges, in exclusive possession of their immense mass of public wealth ? All men now know the amount of this mass of property ; all men now know the purposes to which it is applied ; and the people, whether Dissenters or churchmen, will never rest, until it is employed for real public purposes.

The Dissenters will find themselves under the necessity of being *frank* with the church-people ; and of demanding with them, that the whole of this immense affair shall be revised ; and that it shall be dealt with as something over which the legislature has complete control. The Ministers seem to be the only persons in the country who are blind upon the subject ; and it is to be feared that they will not open their eyes until it be too late. The measures which they contemplate make up a revo-

lution; but it is a revolution that gives satisfaction to no human being. As the church was established by LAW, so by LAW it ought to be at once unestablished; the whole of its property is public property: it ought to be all resumed by law; and the church-religion put upon the same footing with that of any description of Dissenters. As to *property*, the tithe project itself shows that it is all public property; and it signifies not for men to put forth pretensions upon the subject, reason says that the whole of this property ought to be resumed. There is no other way of settling the thing quietly. It is very true that the aristocracy would be stripped of a large part of their possessions; that is to say, of the public property which they have in their hands; but it is equally true that this must leave them quietly, or there must be a *struggle for it*.

I hope that the Dissenters will not suffer themselves to be put off; and that they will not be prevailed upon to believe that they can ever have substantial justice, without such a change as shall make a complete separation of church and state. There is nothing short of this; while this union remains, no change substantially beneficial can be made: no such change is contemplated at present by the Government; and never will be contemplated by it, as long as the Dissenters refrain from coming forward with a frank and open avowal of that which they really want.

THE POOR-LAW PROJECT.

I HAVE this bill; but I will not now attempt an analysis of it, chiefly because I have not duly considered the extent of all its terrible consequences if attempted to be carried into execution. It is a sort of *Austrian* project: a scheme for bringing every thing und every body within the control, the immediate control, of the kingly part of the Government. This bill will totally abrogate all the local government of the kingdom: the gentlemen and the magistrates will be totally divested of all

power, tending to uphold their character, and to secure their property and their personal safety in the country. I have talked to twenty gentlemen, farmers, and attorneys; every man of them has said: "If this bill be attempted to be put into execution, there will be a revolution in England"; and I am so firmly persuaded of the soundness of their opinion, that I should look upon the result as something inevitable. The rejection of this monstrous scheme by the Lords would assuredly take place, but it would have done for the Ministry in the meanwhile; the bill would remain tied round the neck of GREY and ALTHORP to the last hour of their lives. If this bill be pushed through the House of Commons, a thing that I can hardly believe; and if it be rejected by the Lords, it will give the Lords power to do just what they please with this Ministry. They will see their opportunity of course; and this will be the opportunity for the putting down of this Ministry for ever. The whole nation detests the bill, save and except the hatchers of it.

In the country an execution of this bill is literally impossible: every parish would be plunged into confusion immediately; men would not work, and there must be constables and jailers, or police and soldiers, stationed in every parish. The Parliament may pass the law, but it never can be executed; it would be a mere heap of rubbishy words, flung aside, while the government of parishes would be carried on without any law at all.

However, it is a nice question with me, *whether I ought to wish to see it pass into a law or not*; for, if I believe that it will tend to the destruction of the present system altogether; that it will tend to put an end to that system which taxes the poor man's malt to pay the clerks who write out titles for the *Knights of the Bath*: that system which makes the working people pay eight shillings a week to keep soldiers' children, while their own children are allowed but one and threepence a week to keep them; that system that compels the working people to pay old sol-

diers in CHELSEA hospital twelve shillings a week to keep them, while old worn-out labourers are allowed two and sixpence a week to keep them; that system which compels the people of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to keep in their pay two hundred admirals, and four hundred and fifty generals; that system which makes them pay 75,000*l.* for building up one single gateway to one palace: that system which makes them pay a pension of twenty-five hundred pounds a year to BURKE, thirty-five years after BURKE is dead: if the passing of this project into a law, and the attempting to enforce that law; if these have a tendency to put an end to that system, then I must hesitate long before I will say that I wish such law not to be passed, and not to be attempted to be enforced.

¶ Mortal men are not wise: they do not, and they generally will not, see, at the moment, that which is for the best in the end. They often oppose, with all their might, that which they ought to wish to see take place. Who knows that this very project is not the thing destined to bring to issue the great question, whether the nation be to continue to be burdened as it is now, or to be effectually relieved from those burdens? It is very curious to observe, with what coolness men talk about "*revolution*." The word seems to frighten nobody; and, in proportion as they look at this matter with coolness, they view all the wild projects that are going on with comparative indifference: men have not made up their minds with regard to what is to take place; but they have all made up their minds to the belief, that something very great, some very great change in the state and condition of this country, will take place.

And, here the mind dwells with a sort of wonder on the working of events, and admires to see how things work on, in spite of all the efforts that the policy of man and the power of states can make to prevent it.

This country had arrived at a very bad state, after the first American war; but still, in that state, or a state not worse than that, it might have gone on for

ages and ages, without any great change in that great limb of the state, the church. But, the aristocracy and clergy, seeing that the French people had extinguished those orders, said, "We must go to war with the French people: we must compel them to go back again: we must restore the Bourbons; we must restore the clergy, or the example comes to England, and we ourselves shall be extinguished." Upon this ground they made a twenty-two years' war upon France: they restored the Bourbons; this present King of ours took the Bourbon King over to France in a triumphal yacht. They restored an aristocracy of some sort: they re-established a sort of clergy; and they sang "*Te deum*": they roasted oxen; they made a jubilee: they boasted, that they had secured aristocracy and clergy for ever.

Now *look at them!* They are themselves actually making a revolution in the church; and it is demanded of them that they make a still greater revolution; every man sees that they must make that greater revolution. One of the professed objects of the French war was, to prevent parliamentary reform; and they have made one themselves; made a little one, to prevent the people making a great one. This is all very strange; but all this has been produced by that very French war, which was intended to prevent it. But this is not all: everything is *upon the shake*; no man relies on the durability of any establishment: corporations, church, poor-laws: all is shaking: all is upon the change; and, he must be a very bold man, who will pretend to fix a limit to that change. There are, in another part of this *Register*, two petitions from the landowners of Worcestershire. I beg the reader to attend well to them. It is impossible to read these petitions, and not to be convinced, that some great measure must soon take place with regard to the *debt*, or with regard to the paper-money. The debt is now *visibly* taking away the estates of the landowners. It appears to be impossible that this can go on for any length of time. It has been going on a long

while; but it is now rapid and visible. Yet there is monstrous difficulty in doing anything with the matter. Perhaps more than half the members of both Houses of Parliament are fundholders as well as landowners. No small part of them have children, whose fortunes are locked up in the funds. Then the dead-weight (amounting to little short of five millions a year); the pensioners; the grantees; the sinecure placemen and women; all feel that they are in the same boat with the fundholders. Then come those who have annuities paid for, and receivable, or to become receivable, in insurance-offices. Touch the funds, and you touch these, too. The beneficed clergy are all fundholders to a greater or less extent. A large part of the dead-weight people are fundholders, or have annuities dependent on the funds. In this state of things, who is to expect that any thing will be done with the debt until agricultural ruin has gone on to the very verge of convulsion?

In the meanwhile, that part of the people, the mere tradesmen, the general run of farmers, and the working-people of all classes, have no interest in the sustaining of the funds; and, in proportion as they perceive that this is the great cause of their oppression, they will become discontented. These gentlemen in Worcestershire complain of PEEL'S Bill; they want it, and its consequences, taken into consideration by Parliament. They manifestly want an issue of small notes. That would be a revolution immediately. Or, they want a reduction of the interest of the debt: it is too late to effect that in a peaceable manner. So that there appears to be no mode of relieving these men who are losing their estates, who are sinking in the scale of society every day of their lives, and who appear not to have the smallest chance of escape, by any peaceable and quiet means. However, they have been the workers of their own ruin; they have not been under a Government of Jacobins and Levellers; they have killed, or otherwise destroyed, all those; they have hunted reformers and radicals like wild beasts, for forty

long years; it is, therefore, their own affair; and of that affair let them make the best that they can.

DISSENTERS DEPUTATION TO EARL GREY.

I WILL first insert the account as I find it in the newspapers, which is as follows:

INTERVIEW OF THE DEPUTATION OF DISSENTERS FROM GLASGOW WITH EARL GREY.

Yesterday morning, at twelve o'clock, the deputation, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Heugh, the Rev. Andrew Marshall, and James Johnston, Esq., were introduced by James Oswald, Esq., M.P., to Earl Grey.

Mr. Oswald immediately retired, and Lord Grey requested the deputation to be seated.

Dr. HEUGH then said he held in his hand a memorial to his lordship from the inhabitants of Glasgow, which, if it was his lordship's pleasure, he would proceed to read. With Lord Grey's permission Dr. Heugh proceeded to read the memorial.

[The memorial is of great length, and prays for a complete separation of church and state].

During the reading of this memorial, his lordship only once interrupted Dr. H. to say, that "he was very much mistaken if he imagined that churchmen were a minority in the empire."

When Dr. Heugh had done reading the memorial, he added, that these sentiments were embodied in a petition to Parliament, which had received nearly 50,000 signatures.

Earl GREY thanked the memorialists for the kind and honourable mention made of him, but he must say he was much surprised at the tone and character of that memorial. During a long political life he had ever done, and was now doing, what he could to remove any just causes of complaint on the part of the Dissenters, and he had trusted that the relief already granted and now granting would have met their utmost wishes. Now, however, that they took

this open ground against the principle of all church establishments, he would conceal nothing from them, but at once avow that he was conscientiously attached to the established church, and that believing its existence to be intimately connected with the well-being of the state, he would do all in his power to uphold it. This was his honest conviction, and he expected to receive credit for it as such.

Mr. MARSHALL said, there was one thing of which he wished his lordship to be particularly assured, that the views stated in the memorial were not taken up hastily or on doubtful grounds; that they were the fruit of deliberate inquiry; that the memorialists held them as religious principles; and that although their applications to the legislature should for a time be disregarded, it was not possible the cause could die.

Earl GREY said, he believed what had just been stated, that the deputation and those who had signed the petition were acting honestly and from conscientious motives; but really, when he saw Dissenters taking up such ground, he was almost led to feel as if he should abandon all efforts in despair. They were now doing the very thing which those who opposed the concessions he had advocated had said they would do.

Mr. JOHNSTON said they were doing what they must do—following out their principles; and he would state to his lordship, as an evidence how rapidly these opinions were spreading among the people, that the public meeting at which he had the honour to preside, and from which this memorial came, was as respectable as any he had ever seen in Glasgow; and while last year in three weeks only 15,000 names were obtained to a petition embodying the same principles, this year, in nine days, nearly 50,000 signatures were appended to the petition for the separation of the church from the state.

Earl GREY said, whatever might be the spread of such opinions in Scotland, he trusted the Dissenters of England held no such notions.

Dr. HEUGH would confirm the state-

ment of his friend, that they acted from religious principle, and that, doing so, it was impossible that any circumstances could drive them from the continued advocacy of these opinions. With regard to the English Dissenters, he (Dr. H.) could assure his lordship that all the English Dissenters, who had avowed anything on the subject, had avowed it as their decided opinion that church establishments were in principle unjust and unscriptural.

Mr. Johnston had to state to his lordship, that the Lord Provost of Glasgow, several of the city councillors, and many churchmen, had signed the Glasgow petition.

"Churchmen"! said Earl Grey, "ah! but these are only of the Kirk of Scotland."

"True, my lord," said Mr. Johnston, "but the principle applies to all establishments."

Dr. Heugh then said, "My lord, have you any questions to put to us upon any point connected with this memorial?"

His lordship said he had none, and the deputation withdrew.

Thus the matter is brought to issue! I endeavoured to draw from the members who stood forward for the Dissenters, an explicit avowal of these very sentiments; but I could not do it; and there is nothing that I detest like hypocrisy. My colleague and myself waited upon Lord GREY with a memorial from the Dissenters of OLDHAM, most distinctly and honestly stating, that their object was to obtain a complete separation of church and state. His lordship told us, that he was prepared to do what could be done with regard to marriages, burials, church-rates, registry of births, and with regard to the Universities. We told him, that we would not fail (and we did not) to report to our constituents the gracious manner in which he had been pleased to receive the memorial, and to state to them the things which he was prepared to do in their behalf, if he could; but, having expressed his dissent to the

prayer of the memorial for a separation of church and state, I told his lordship, that it would be hypocrisy in me to suppress my opinion, that nothing would satisfy the memorialists, short of a total separation of the church from the state; or, in other words, a legal repeal of the established church altogether. This deputation from Scotland brings the Ministers at open issue with the Dissenters, who have been their principal supporters, and in whom they must still live, or have no life. I believe that more than one half of the House of Commons are Dissenters or Catholics, or both together; and, if my health be sufficiently restored, and no other member do it, I will move, at once, for a disconnexion of the church from the state; and this, too, before the end of the present session of Parliament; because I am convinced, for the reasons which I have long and long been laying before the public, that, until this be done, there is no chance of anything like peaceable and settled government in England.

This is the first time that the Ministers have ventured to *reproach* the Dissenters. Now they are told that they are fulfilling the predictions of their enemies; now they are reproached with being that which the Tory churchmen said they were. In short, it is a downright quarrel with them; and a declaration that the Ministry will oppose them with all their might.

Lord GREY is mistaken when he appeals to the *numerousness of the churchmen in England*. If he mean to call all those churchmen, who are not regular members of settled dissenting chapels, he may be right enough; but, if by *churchman*, he means a man who wishes the present establishment to *stand as it is*, I can assure him that nineteen-twentieths of the people, if not ninety-nine hundredths of them, are Dissenters. There are no persons, who are not immediately interested in the thing, who wish this church to stand as it is.

Lord GREY is well aware that he shall have every Tory to support him in opposition to the Dissenters; and,

with this present Parliament he *may* get along in spite of them; but the most fashionable *pledge* will soon be, *a repeal of the church establishment*. Thus this Ministry will lose its principal supporters; or it will give way, and let the church down. It cannot give way, constituted as it now is: the Prime Minister, with two bishops in his family, and God knows how many others dependent on the same source. In short, the demand of the Dissenters is just and reasonable, and necessary to be granted; and yet it cannot be granted without taking from the aristocracy that immense portion of the wealth of the nation, which it has so long exclusively enjoyed; and yet it *must* be granted: the wrong to nineteen-twentieths of the people is too great to be longer endured. A mere vote of the Houses of Parliament will decide nothing. If the Dissenters persevere, and with frankness and resolution, this establishment must now be repealed. It would be a monstrous change, to be sure; but the change must come; and the sooner, and the more cheerfully, the better.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.

I CONGRATULATE Mr. O'CONNELL, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. SHEIL, and their countrymen, who have made this noble stand for their country. What a grand muster! Five hundred and sixty one members present; and Mr. O'CONNELL left in a minority of *thirty-eight*! I dare say he recollected that old PYM began with a minority of THREE. This vote decides nothing, except that Ireland is a precious good thing; that there are great numbers who feel how good it is, and who do not like to part with it. My reasons for a repeal of the union would have been somewhat different from any that I perceive to have been stated; but I should have added one to Mr. O'CONNELL'S minority, at any rate. I blame the advocates for the repeal for condescending to answer any of the arguments founded upon the amount of *exports* or *imports*, which had nothing at all to do with the matter.

This discussion will do great good : it will have shown to the present generation of Englishmen, what sort of an affair this union is ; how it was accomplished ; and, as to its effects, they are constantly before our eyes. This is one great matter ; but the great matter of all is, what is the condition of the people of Ireland ? Not how much can be screwed out of Ireland ; but what is the condition of the people of Ireland ? This is the question ; and the only question ; and if that condition be perfectly intolerable, there wants a change ; there wants a better government ; and that government is not to be had without a repeal of the union.

HISTORY OF GEORGE THE FOURTH.

THE sixteenth number of this work does not appear this month, for reasons well known to the readers of the *Register*. That must have no cough in it !

THE STAMP DUTIES.

To the Editor of the Dumfries Times.

ANNAN, 16. April, 1834.

SIR,—My chief purpose, in writing this letter, is to aid Mr. Cobbett in his praiseworthy endeavours to procure an equalization of these burdensome duties, which endeavours, I trust, will be vigorously renewed by him, before the present session of Parliament be much older. I earnestly entreat, on the part of your readers, a careful and attentive perusal of what I am about to lay before them. And I am much mistaken, indeed, if, after such perusal, they shall experience any difficulty in deciding the question, so much mooted of late, namely, whether, in the imposing of the stamp duties, our aristocratical law-makers have really given evidence of that "paternal care" of the interests of the industrious classes, for which they

are so apt, on all occasions, to take ample credit.

In the prosecution of my subject I shall, for the sake of perspicuity, follow the order of the schedule, appended to the Act 55 Geo. III. chap 184, with this variation only, that, when contrast is necessary for the purpose of illustration, I shall place in juxta-position, certain of the duties specified in that schedule, which, though pretty nearly allied, stand, owing to its alphabetical arrangement, in parts of it somewhat distant from one another.

Without further preface I proceed to my task.

At the very beginning of the schedule, then, are specified the duties payable on "admissions" of advocates or barristers, attornies or solicitors, masters in Chancery, notaries public, physicians, university graduates, and freemen of corporations ; a little further on are specified the duties payable on "articles of clerkship" to attornies, solicitors, and proctors ; and further on still, the duties payable on "certificates to be taken out yearly" by persons of the last-mentioned professions, as well as by notaries public. These duties will be found, on inspection, to be, many of them, truly enormous. They are duties, however, which must be paid, for the most part, by persons from the more humble ranks of society, seeking the means of acquiring a livelihood ; and it will only be in rare instances that any portion of them will fall upon the aristocracy.

In those instances, again, where members of aristocratical families do seek admission to the professions of law or physic, it is natural to presume, that they will single out those branches which are deemed the most genteel ; and such, accordingly, is the fact. Here it is that contrast will be instructive ! For a tax of 50*l.* once paid, an advocate or barrister, and for a tax of 15*l.* once paid, a physician, may practise during life, either in England or Scotland. An attorney in England, however, must, before he can draw a pen in his profession, pay taxes to the amount of 145*l.*, and a writer in Scotland taxes to the

amount of 105*l.*; while, over and above this, each member of these branches of the profession, must pay annually, if he practise in either metropolis 12*l.*, and if he practise in the country 8*l.* sterling! Such is the favour shown to gentility by our law-makers, such, in short, is one instance of the "paternal care" with which they watch over the interests of—themselves!

If there be anything whatever in the schedule, to operate as a set-off against what has just been adverted to, it must be that portion of it which imposes certain duties on "grants of honour or dignity." It will be seen in a moment, however, that this set-off can be of no avail. The "honour or dignity" of a duke, a marquis, an earl, a viscount, a baron, or a baronet, is really a luxury to those who have a taste for it, and is, therefore, a fit and proper subject for heavy taxation. It can easily be let alone too, without any loss, or any injury, to the person declining it. The conferring of an "honour or dignity," consequently, is a thing altogether different from the admission to a profession by which a man is to earn his bread. And nothing can show forth more effectually the "paternal care" aforesaid, than the simple fact, that the humblest country attorney, putting a fair value upon the "yearly certificate" duties, must pay as much tax for permission to follow his lawful employment, as the most mighty duke pays for his patent of nobility!

I proceed to that part of the schedule which relates to "bills of exchange," and which is as follows:

Bills payable at not more than two months after date, or 60 days after sight—

Amounting to		Not exceeding			
£2	£5 5s.	£0	1	0	
Exceeding 5 5s.	20	0	1	6	
..... 20	30	0	2	0	
..... 30	50	0	2	6	
..... 50	100	0	3	6	
..... 100	200	0	4	6	
..... 200	300	0	5	0	
..... 300	500	0	6	0	
..... 500	1000	0	8	6	
..... 1000	2000	0	12	6	
..... 2000	3000	0	15	0	
..... 3000		1	5	0	

Bills payable at more than two months after date, or 60 days after sight—

Amounting to		Not exceeding			
£2	£5 5s.	£0	1	6	
Exceeding 5 5s.	20	0	2	0	
..... 20	30	0	2	6	
..... 30	50	0	3	6	
..... 50	100	0	4	6	
..... 100	200	0	5	0	
..... 200	300	0	6	0	
..... 300	500	0	8	6	
..... 500	1000	0	12	6	
..... 1000	2000	0	15	0	
..... 2000	3000	1	5	0	
..... 3000		1	10	0	

Now it will hardly be disputed, I think, that the just rule for imposing a tax on bills of exchange, is to proportion that tax, as nearly as may be, to the sums for which they are drawn, if it be not deemed proper, out of favour to the poor man, even to lower the rate as the sums descend in amount. Let us see, however, taking bills payable at upwards of two months after date as the criterion, whether this just rule has been observed, and, if it has not been observed, for whose benefit it has been departed from. For a bill of 5,000*l.*, which sum may moderately be assumed as a medium for the highest class, the duty paid is at the rate of sevenpence and one-fifth of a penny per cent.; for a bill of 1,500*l.*, the medium between 1,000*l.* and 2,000*l.* the duty is one shilling per cent.; for a bill of 250*l.*, the medium between 200*l.* and 300*l.*, the duty is two shillings and fourpence four-fifths of a penny per cent.; for a bill of 40*l.* the medium between 30*l.* and 50*l.* the duty is eight shillings and ninepence per cent.; and for a bill of 3*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*, the medium between 40*s.* and 5*l.* 5*s.*, the duty is no less than forty-one shillings and fourpence halfpenny per cent. It is thus evident that the duty, instead of decreasing, actually increases in proportion as the sum descends in amount; that the favour shown, consequently, is shown to the rich, not to the poor; and that the tax which the poor man pays on his bill for 3*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*, is just about seventy times as much in proportion as the tax which the rich man pays on his bill for 5,000*l.* sterling.

That part of the schedule which relates to bonds is as follows:

	£	s.	d.
Not exceeding.....	50..	1	0 0
Exceeding 50—not exceeding	100..	1	10 0
..... 100.....	200..	2	0 0
..... 200.....	300..	3	0 0
..... 300.....	500..	4	0 0
..... 500.....	1000..	5	0 0
..... 1000.....	2000..	6	0 0
..... 2000.....	3000..	7	0 0
..... 3000.....	4000..	8	0 0
..... 4000.....	5000..	9	0 0
..... 5000.....	10,000..	12	0 0
..... 10,000.....	15,000..	15	0 0
..... 15,000.....	20,000..	20	0 0
..... 20,000.....		25	0 0

Here again the "paternal care" is sufficiently obvious. If one of our magnates borrow 50,000*l.* upon bond, the tax which he pays is at the rate of one shilling per cent. only. If a tradesman borrow 250*l.* in the same manner, the tax which he pays is twenty-four shillings per cent.; and if a poor man borrow 25*l.*, the tax which he pays is eighty shillings per cent. It thus appears that, on this sort of transaction, the tradesman who borrows 250*l.*, pays twenty-four times as much, and the poor man who borrows 25*l.*, eighty times as much tax in proportion, as the peer, perchance, who borrows 50,000*l.*

It will be seen, on inspection of the schedule, that in the duties on "bonds of annuity," there is the same glaring inequality as in those on bonds for specific sums of money. Thus the duty upon a bond of annuity for 5,000*l.* is 25*l.* or two shillings per cent., while the duty on a bond of annuity for 10*l.*, is 1*l.*, or two hundred shillings per cent., being exactly one hundred times as much in proportion.

The duties on "conveyances" stand thus:

	£	s.	d.
Where the purchase, or consideration money, shall not amount to 20 <i>l.</i>		0	10 0
To £20—not to £50.....		1	0 0
.. 50..... 150.....		1	10 0
.. 150..... 300.....		2	0 0
.. 300..... 500.....		3	0 0
.. 500..... 750.....		6	0 0
.. 750..... 1000.....		9	0 0
.. 1000..... 2000.....		12	0 0
.. 2000..... 3000.....		25	0 0
.. 3000..... 4000.....		35	0 0
.. 4000..... 5000.....		45	0 0
.. 5000..... 6000.....		55	0 0

	£	s.	d.
6000..... 7000.....		65	0 0
.. 7000..... 8000.....		75	0 0
.. 8000..... 9000.....		85	0 0
.. 9000..... 10,000.....		95	0 0
.. 10,000..... 12,500.....		110	0 0
.. 12,500..... 15,000.....		130	0 0
.. 15,000..... 20,000.....		170	0 0
.. 20,000..... 30,000.....		240	0 0
.. 30,000..... 40,000.....		350	0 0
.. 40,000..... 50,000.....		450	0 0
.. 50,000..... 60,000.....		550	0 0
.. 60,000..... 80,000.....		650	0 0
.. 80,000..... 100,000.....		800	0 0
.. 100,000..or upwards		1000	0 0

It was upon this part of the schedule that Mr. SPRING RICE mainly took his stand, in his last year's combat, "foot to foot and shoulder to shoulder," with the "hon. Member for Oldham." Having, with the obvious view of obtaining credit for candour, admitted that the duty on "conveyances" was unjustly high, when the consideration money was below 150*l.*, he stated with truth, that after passing that sum, it was a fair and equal duty, being just about one per cent. in all cases, until the consideration money ascended as high as 100,000*l.* This being accomplished, he, as we are informed, assumed a very high tone, maintained that he had completely established the integrity and impartiality of the law-making class, and accused his opponent of something approaching to calumny; whereupon, as we are further informed, the intelligent, disinterested, and most polite little sprigs of family by whom the treasury benches are usually occupied and surrounded, began to caper for joy; and while they encouraged their champion by cheers and loud cries of "hear him, hear him," assailed every one who attempted to answer him, with all manner of strange, uncouth, and brutish noises!

But let it be asked, in sober seriousness, who they are that really bear the burden of this "conveyance" duty; this duty which, in the midst of so much and such glaring inequality, appears to be tolerably equal? The answer is—Not surely the aristocracy; not, by any means, that class by whom the laws heretofore have been, and, unfortunately, still are, essentially made. The great landholder, if his estate be en-

tailed, cannot sell; and, if it be even free, is rarely under the necessity of doing so. A very small portion of this tax, consequently, falls upon his class. It is almost entirely paid by the owners of that portion of real property, consisting of small estates in land and houses, which passes frequently from hand to hand, and forms in reality a most important article of commerce. The dealers in this property are not nobles; they belong, on the contrary, to the industrious classes: and hence it is, perhaps, that, as in the case of "indentures of apprenticeship," the tax on "conveyances" approaches so near to equality.

Let contrast be here again resorted to for the sake of further illustration. Although the aristocracy do not sell their estates, it is well known that they borrow largely upon mortgage; and how, it may be asked, does the mortgage part of the schedule stand? Is it as just and fair as that which relates to "conveyances?" Let us see. Here it is:

	£	£	s.	d.
Not exceeding.....	50	1	0	0
Exceeding 50—not exceeding 100.....	100	1	10	0
..... 100.....	200	2	0	0
..... 200.....	300	3	0	0
..... 300.....	500	4	0	0
..... 500.....	1000	5	0	0
..... 1000.....	2000	6	0	0
..... 2000.....	3000	7	0	0
..... 3000.....	4000	8	0	0
..... 4000.....	5000	9	0	0
..... 5000.....	10,000	13	0	0
..... 10,000.....	15,000	15	0	0
..... 15,000.....	20,000	20	0	0
..... 20,000.....	25	0	0	0

From this part of the schedule it appears, that, while the great landowner, on his mortgage of 100,000*l.* (and there are many of even larger amount), pays a tax of only sixpence per cent., the merchant, on his mortgage of 1,500*l.*, pays eight shillings per cent.; the tradesman, on his mortgage of 250*l.*, twenty-four shillings per cent.; and the artisan, on his mortgage of 25*l.* no less than eighty shillings per cent. If this be not enough to convince John Bull of the kindness, as well as the justice, of those exalted beings who are

born to make laws for him, his head must be as impenetrable as the nether millstone.

This, however, is not yet all. Though the Act, 55 Geo. III., chap. 184, exhibited pretty strong proofs of the "paternal care" of our legislature, it was not deemed altogether sufficient. The mortgage duties certainly had, by it, been made tolerably comfortable; but then the rub was, that when a mortgage came to be transferred, the *ad valorem* "conveyance" duty was chargeable upon the "transfer" of it. This was a sad bar to the general happiness, particularly when, in 1822, money became scarce, and creditors somewhat inexorable on the score of interest. And how did our wise and just law-makers remedy the evil? Why, by passing a law, 3 Geo. IV., chap. 117, making the duty on the transfer of a mortgage for 200,000*l.* precisely the same as the duty on the transfer of a mortgage for 20*l.*, namely, 1*l.* 15*s.* In their hurry to do justice, moreover, they seem to have forgotten the poor man altogether. For whereas, prior to 1822, a mortgage for any sum less than 20*l.* might have been transferred for a duty of 10*s.*; a mortgage for any sum less than 50*l.* for a duty of 1*l.*; and a mortgage for any sum less than 150*l.* for a duty of 1*l.* 10*s.*; the law of 1822 affixes the same duty (1*l.* 15*s.*) upon the transfers of all mortgages; and thus, though meant and intended as a measure of relief, positively taxes the humble borrower more than he was taxed before.

Now, I would really like to hear Mr. Spring Rice attempt to explain some of these things before an assembly composed of men of common sense and ordinary intelligence. He admits that the "conveyance" duty is unfair, because it is not, in all cases, justly proportioned to the consideration money. But if he admit this, what will he say to the duties on bills, and bonds, and, above all, to the duties on mortgages? How will he account for the startling fact that the scale for conveyances,—the duty on which falls lightly, if at all, on the law-making class—goes up by a pretty fair gradation (the lowest sums

excepted) to 100,000*l.*, while the scale for mortgages—the duty on which falls heavily on that same class—decreases rapidly in proportion as it ascends in amount, and stops altogether at 20,000*l.* I should really like to have him foot to foot, and shoulder to shoulder, on this topic, upon a clear stage, and with no favour. And if he could render me a good reason why it is just and proper that the mortgage duty scale should stop at 20,000*l.*, and the conveyance duty scale ascend to 100,000*l.*, I would certainly look upon him, thenceforth, as a sort of treasury conjuror!

But Mr. Spring Rice will say, perhaps, as he has said before, “Oh! this mortgage duty is evaded by the depositing of title deeds, and is, therefore, seldom paid.” This is an answer which would hardly deceive a child. If a mortgage can be made perfectly secure by a deposit of title-deeds, it can be made just as secure, in the case of a loan to a nobleman of two hundred thousand pounds, as in the case of a loan to a tradesman of two hundred. It may fairly be assumed, therefore, that, in equal numbers of loans of each class, there will be equal numbers of deposits of titles, and equal numbers of regular mortgage deeds. The case, consequently, is just where it was, Mr. Spring Rice’s argument being simply good for nothing. It may be added too that, in Scotland, a deposit of title deeds is not worth a straw in the way of constituting a security; and that the same rule must necessarily take place in England, as soon as a regular system of registration of deeds shall be established in that part of the United Kingdom.

The schedule for leases, which may be next adverted to, stands thus:

Where the yearly rent shall not amount to 20 <i>l.</i>	} £ 1 0 0
Where it shall amount to 20 <i>l.</i> , not to 100 <i>l.</i>	
To £100, not to £200	2 0 0
.... 200, 400	3 0 0
.... 400, 600	4 0 0
.... 600, 800	5 0 0
.... 800, 1000	6 0 0
.... 1000, or upwards	10 0 0

Here again the usual attention has been paid to the principle of equality.

Upon the lease of a large farm of 3000*l.* per annum (and there are many such), the duty is six shilling and eightpence per cent. on the annual rent, while upon the lease of a farm of 150*l.* per annum it is twenty-six shillings and eightpence per cent., and, upon the lease of a tenement of 10*l.* per annum, no less than ten pounds per cent. The disparity in this case is not certainly quite so glaring as in the case of bonds or of mortgages; but it is amply sufficient to afford another strong proof of the paternal care of our legislators!

Policies of insurance on lives may be next adverted to; and the schedule, so far as they are concerned, runs thus:—

Where the sum insured shall not amount to 500 <i>l.</i>	} £ 1 0 0
Where the sum shall amount to 500 <i>l.</i> not to 1000 <i>l.</i>	
To £1000, not to £3000	2 0 0
.... 3000, 5000	3 0 0
.... 5000, or upwards	4 0 0
	5 0 0

In endeavouring to defend the Government on this head, in his “shoulder to shoulder, and foot to foot” argument, Mr. Spring Rice is reported to have said, that the inequality was not so great in reality, as it appeared to be, because it was not the practice of insurance offices to take any greater risk under one policy than 5000*l.* Granting that this were the case, the scale is unequal, even as far as it goes, because, by the plainest rule of common arithmetic—whatever the arithmetic of the treasury may say—if 500*l.* give 1*l.*, 5000*l.* ought to give, not 5*l.*, but 10*l.*! And again, since insurance offices are in no way bound to follow any such practice as that alleged, while it is a well-known fact that insurances are daily effected on lives, either at one or more offices, for sums far beyond 5000*l.*, would it not be decent, if the stamp duties are to be continued, to extend the scale a little farther?

Passing by “Promissory notes,” to which may be strictly applied the observations already made on “bills of exchange”; and passing by, likewise, “protests” on “bills of exchange or promissory notes,” with this simple remark, that the duties on them are also grossly unequal, I come now to “re-

ceipts," as to which, giving effect to an act of last session, the schedule will stand as follows :

Receipt or discharge given for or upon the payment of money

Amounting to	Not amounting to			
£5	£10	£0	0	3
10	20	0	0	6
20	50	1	0	0
50	100	0	1	6
100	200	0	2	6
200	300	0	4	0
300	500	0	5	0
500	1000	0	7	6
1000, or upwards		0	10	0

I believe, that not very many receipt stamps are used in conducting the great mercantile concerns of the country; and it may fairly be assumed, I think, that by far the greater portion of the receipt duty is paid by landlords upon discharges for their rents, by small retail dealers upon discharges to their credit customers, and by artisans, upon discharges to their employers. And how, it will naturally be asked, does the scale of duties affect each of these classes, in proportion to their respective interests? Why, thus: The wealthy landlord, in giving a discharge to his tenant for 1,500*l.*, as a half-year's rent, pays a tax of eight-pence per cent. only on the sum received, while the little shopkeeper or artisan, in giving a discharge to his customer for his small account of 7*l.* 10*s.*, pays a tax of three shillings and fourpence per cent., or just five times as much in proportion.

Without stopping to quote that part of the schedule, which relates to the duties on "settlements" of "definite and certain" sums of money, or to make any remark upon it, further than to say, that these duties are grossly unequal inasmuch as upon a sum of 50,000*l.*, only one shilling per cent. is chargeable, while upon a sum of 500*l.* the charge is seven shillings per cent. Without stopping to do either of these things, I shall proceed to the "probate," "administration," and "legacy" duties; in other words, to those taxes which are paid out of personal property, on its passage from the dead to the living, which will form a very proper conclusion to my exposition.

As the "probate" and "administration" duties, though they differ in amount (the latter being considerably higher in proportion to the value of the estate, than the former), seem to proceed upon the same principle of gradation. I shall take the latter only as the ground-work of my remarks. But, as it would occupy too much space to insert the scale of them at length, I shall content myself by giving the 1st, 5th, 10th, 15th, 20th, 25th, 30th, 35th, 40th, 45th, and 50th lines of it, which are as follow :

		£	s.	d.
Where the estate and effects are to the value of 20 <i>l.</i> and under		0	10	0
the value of 50 <i>l.</i>				
Amounting to	Under			
.... £ 300	£ 450	11	0	0
.... 1500	2000. ..	60	0	0
.... 6000	7000	180	0	0
.... 12,000	14,000	330	0	0
.... 25,000	30,000	600	0	0
.... 50,000	60,000	1125	0	0
.... 100,000	120,000	2250	0	0
.... 200,000	250,000	4500	0	0
.... 500,000	600,000	11,250	0	0
.... 1,000,000 and upwards		22,500	0	0

The first remark that presents itself on this tax, is, that it too is unequal. Thus a personal estate of two millions (and there have been such) pays only 12*s.* 6*d.* per cent. of duty, while a personal estate of 250*l.* pays 64*s.* per cent., or somewhat more than five times as much in proportion. But inequality is not the grand objection to this tax, which, like the indenture tax and the conveyance tax, and for the same reason too, is, unless as to small estates, tolerably equal. The grand objection to it is, that the class, by which our laws are made, is almost totally exempted from it. The most magnificent freehold estate descends from father to son, or, if held in fee-simple, is conveyed by will to a stranger, without any charge for stamp duty.* But if an industrious man die, leaving 250*l.* in money or in personal property of any

* In Scotland a duty does attach to a conveyance of real property, by will or disposition mortis causa; but, this duty whatever be the value of the estate, is in all cases, just 1*l.* 15*s.* Hence the argument is strengthened by the circumstance.

sort, no less than eight pounds must be paid at the stamp-office, independent of "legacy duties" and charges to a vexatious amount, before a penny's worth of what he has left can be lawfully applied to the support of his perhaps, helpless widow and family.

The "legacy" duty is a per centage upon the value of the estate, varying according to the degree of relationship, and seems, therefore, so far as it goes, to be a pretty fair tax. But here again the law-maker goes free; and thence the injustice. While the relations of a man, who leaves two or three hundred pounds in money, or in personal property, must, over and above the "probate" or, "administration" duty, of which I have already spoken, pay one per cent., three per cent., or five per cent., as the case may be, in name of tax upon that sum, the heir of the mighty proprietor of land succeeds to his predecessor's estate, worth two or three millions perhaps, without paying so much as one farthing. This is really past endurance, and cannot much longer be endured.

I may add, in reference to the "probate" or "administration" duty, that, even in the case where a man dies insolvent, unable to pay so much as a shilling in the pound to his creditors—this duty is rigorously exacted on all the personal property that may happen to be in his possession at the time of his death. It is true, that in such a case, a return of duty may be obtained, on its being shown that the debts owing actually exceeded the value of the estate; but then the difficulty and expense of obtaining this return are such, that any man, who has ever claimed it in one instance, would rather forfeit 5*l.* at the very least, than go through the operation a second time. There is a curious stamp-office regulation, too, regarding this return. If it be shown that the debts more than exhaust the estate, one would naturally imagine that all the duty ought to be given back. But no! The regulation just alluded to, is in these words: As the return of the stamp duty on inventories is restricted to the debts actually

due and owing from the deceased at the time of his death, it follows, that the funeral inventory, and testamentary expenses are not the debts of the deceased, and, therefore, are not to be included in the schedule of debts paid; consequently in no case can the whole of the duty be returned; inasmuch as the amount of those expenses will always leave a balance upon which the inventory duty must attach, unless the same shall not amount to 20*l.*" which regulation being interpreted, means simply this—that, because the creditors of an insolvent debtor deceased, have necessarily been at the expense of burying him—of reporting an inventory of his estate—and of administering to it—because they have thus been compelled to diminish the fund for the payment of their own dividends—therefore, they ought to pay a tax upon their very additional loss! This, surely, surpasses all that ever was before heard of in the way of taxation! The conduct of Pharaoh, in compelling the Israelites to make brick without straw or stubble, was nothing but a sorry joke to it!

Much more might be said on this subject; but I have said enough, I trust, to draw the attention of the public strongly towards it. The repeal of the whole stamp duties would be a mighty benefit to the country; but since that is not likely to be accomplished, the industrious classes, now that the juggle is exposed, ought never to cease from agitating, until these taxes shall be fairly equalized; until, in short, its due share shall be paid by that class, which, in the imposition of them, has so admirably evidenced its disinterestedness and love of justice! I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

JAS. LITTLE.

POOR-LAW BILL.

(From the Morning Chronicle, 29 April, 1834.)

THE vestry of St. Marybone was specially summoned on Saturday to take into consideration the bill brought in by Lord ALTHORP founded upon the Poor-Law Commissioners' Report. The

board was most numerously attended, there being at one time nearly 100 members present. A resolution, condemnatory of the principle and details of the bill, and a petition founded upon it, praying the House of Commons to reject the bill, was moved by Mr. PORTER, who spoke with great severity against Lord ALTHORP and the Government for sanctioning a measure which he denounced as subversive of the rights of the people, and concluded by saying he would rather live the remainder of his days under such a despotic Government as the last than under a Government who would sanction such a bill as that under consideration.

Lord KENYON would admit that there were parts of the bill which he could not sanction, and particularly those clauses erecting a central board with extraordinary powers; at the same time his lordship thought such was the fearful state of the poor, that some remedial measure of an extensive nature was called for.

Sir SAMUEL WHALLEY addressed the board at great length, commenting upon the bill, clause by clause, and censuring it from the beginning to the end. In the course of his remarks he stated that he was the only member of the House of Commons who had ventured to raise his voice against the introduction of the bill, which he could not but call arbitrary and unconstitutional; and, after expressing his utter astonishment at his friend, the honourable member for Middlesex, giving such a measure his support, Sir SAMUEL concluded by declaring that the directors and guardians of the poor would be degrading themselves by acting under such a court of Star Chamber as the bill contemplated.

Mr. HUME, M.P., immediately rose, and in a speech of upwards of an hour's duration, replied *seriatim* to the various objections urged by Sir S. Whalley, who, he contended, had taken a most erroneous view of the intentions, and what would be the operation of the bill, and had conjured up imaginary phantoms, which he had allowed to bewilder and frighten him. In his (Mr. H.'s) opinion, arrived at after a long and

anxious consideration of the whole subject of the poor-laws, Lord Althorp and the Government would accomplish more real good for the country by the proposed measure than any they had brought forward, and he should give it his conscientious support; but at the same time he did not say that there might not be objections to many of the details, and if so, they must and would be modified in committee.

Mr. H. WILSON said he was opposed both to the principle and details of the bill, and would go to the full length with the honourable representative of the borough, in characterizing it as an atrocious and unconstitutional measure; and would say further, that it was of such a character that Parliament could not pass it.

The Rev. Dr. FELLOWES said there were times when it might be necessary, and circumstances which would justify the depositary of extraordinary powers in the hands of a few, for the benefit of the many. Temporary dictatorships had even been resorted to by ancient nations in cases of peril, and he considered that the abyss of universal pauperism which the nation was falling into would justify the resort, for a limited period, to measures which, under other circumstances might be deemed unconstitutional. He (Dr. F.) thought the establishment of a central board of commissioners absolutely necessary to secure uniformity of action in carrying out any extensive remedial measure.

Mr. HOVENDEN could not go to the length of saying the vestry should petition against the bill altogether, although he agreed with many gentlemen who had spoken, that the clauses of the bill were most objectionable, and such as ought not to pass into a law; he concurred in the principle of the bill, but objected to its machinery, and therefore could not support the petition.

The Rev. Dr. DIBDEN, in a luminous and energetic address, opposed the petition.

Mr. UNDERWOOD detailed the objectionable clauses in the bill, and said he should support the petition against it. Captain GOWAN concurred in the

view taken by the member for Middlesex, and said, surely the vestry of St. Marybonne would not wish the country to be deprived of a bill which was calculated to produce so much benefit to the people as a whole, because, in this particular parish, a few fortuitous circumstances might have conspired to render it unnecessary here; he thought that would be anything but patriotic; it would, indeed, be selfish. If, however (said Captain G.), an attempt should be made, to give these commissioners undefined and unlimited powers, such an attempt must be resisted; but he could not so interpret the clauses in the present bill.

Mr. JACKSON said, if he had made up his mind to have objected to the bill before he had heard the speech of Sir Samuel Whalley, he should most certainly have paused after hearing the astounding fact that the bill was received with acclamations by the representatives of the people *en masse*, with the single and solitary exception of the hon. member himself, who tells us he was the only member of the House that had the courage to oppose its introduction. Why, how were they to interpret this almost unanimous approbation of a measure by the House? Either that the hon. member for Marybonne was the only Solomon there, or that the bill was not of that fearful character which gentlemen had described it to be? He (Mr. Jackson) contended that the question had been argued upon a confined view of the subject, and under the assumption that the whole kingdom was made up of parishes such as Marybonne, where the machinery was capable of carrying out the contemplated changes; but the fact was, that the mass of parishes into which the kingdom was divided were so limited in extent that a union of them was necessary, and there must be machinery to accomplish that, and a central board of commissioners was proposed. If, in the establishment of such a board, it could be shown that Parliament was about conferring dangerous powers which were calculated to abridge the rights of parishioners, those must be

opposed. But if he read the bill correctly, it did not propose to give the commissioners (as asserted by preceding speakers) undefined powers; the bill laid down certain great principles upon which relief was to be founded, and the commissioners were the instruments whereby those principles were to be carried out, and the rules, regulations, and by-laws, must be all subservient to the law.

Mr Nelms, Mr. Raistrick, and Mr. Green, followed; Mr. Potter then shortly replied, when a division was called for, and the Chairman declared the resolution and petition to be carried by a majority of four.

The discussion lasted seven hours.

TRADES' UNIONS.

THE Duke of NEWCASTLE presented petitions from St. James's Chapel, Nottingham; and from some other places in Nottingham, for protection to the church; and a similar petition from St. Peter's Chapel in that town. The noble Duke observed that the last petition was signed by the mayor of the town, and by some other members of the corporation; and if there had been no other good proceeding from the Reform Bill, there had been this one, that though the corporation of Nottingham had been for a long time Dissenters, they did not all appear to be so now. The noble Duke then presented petitions from East Retford, for the better observance of the Sabbath, and against the Beer Bill. The last of these petitions he moved to be referred to the committee; and he took that opportunity of putting a question to the noble Viscount opposite, on the subject of the trades' unions. The noble Duke was understood to complain of the frequent processions of the trades' unions, and to ask whether the noble Viscount intended to take any measures to put a stop to them?

LORD MELBOURNE could not express too strongly his disapprobation of the manner in which some of these unions were at present conducted. He was

not aware that they were not in themselves legal, or that there existed any means by the law as it stood at present to prevent the processions. He trusted that it would not be requisite to have recourse to any new laws on the subject; for, from information he had recently received, he had reason to hope that many of the persons composing these unions would return to their senses, and see the injury they were doing themselves by the course which they were now pursuing, and that the impropriety of their conduct being represented to them, the unions would be abandoned by those who had unfortunately joined them.

The Marquis of LONDONDERRY said that he wished the noble Viscount was more aware than he appeared to be of the necessity of some interference on the part of the Government. There had recently been an assemblage of six or seven thousand men in one of these processions, and the part of the town in which he resided was kept in a state of constant alarm by these processions. The Government seemed to think that these unions would die a natural death, but he believed they were mistaken in that opinion. He had heard this day that fifteen thousand fresh names had been enrolled among the unionists. Their numbers were already sufficiently large. There was a force of 30,000 men assembled on Monday last, and marched through the town. These things could not take place without creating uneasiness in the minds of the peaceable inhabitants, and he implored the noble Viscount to take into consideration some measure for the safety and quiet of the people.

The Earl of ELDON could not refrain from offering a few observations to their lordships on this subject. It seemed to him as if they were losing sight of all the settled principles on which a country ought to be governed. It appeared to him that the multitude assembled the other day, whose aspect was that of force (hear, hear), could not but debilitate the Government, and he was of opinion that the assembling of large numbers in this menacing force was in

itself an offence. (Hear). He knew too, if such an opinion had been stated from the mouths of the judges of England, that it would have been of infinite use (hear, hear): it could not have failed to produce a most important effect. He knew that the Government had their reasons for not doing this; and being aware of those reasons, there was no man who was more inclined to make liberal allowance for them. He remembered when a noble Lord had said that no matter in what numbers people met, if they did not meet for an unlawful purpose, the mere numbers would not make their meeting illegal. He agreed that if the subjects of the country lawfully met to discuss their grievances, their numbers would not make such a meeting illegal; but if they met as their lordships were told, in those sources of authority which they had the misfortune to refer to every morning of their lives, these men did meet, their purpose was unlawful. They were told that meetings had been held to refuse the payment of certain taxes. They should, perhaps, soon be told that meetings had been held to refuse payment of all taxes whatever. (Hear, hear). He asserted that these meetings superseded the authority of the Government. (Hear). The people had a right to a discussion of their grievances, but no bodies of men had a right to meet for the purposes for which some of these meetings had lately been held. He repeated that they had a right to the discussion of their grievances; but that any class of men could join together to declare that they would disobey the law was, he asserted, an offence against the law. Neither had any men a right to meet together to constrain others to adopt a particular course in their business. (Hear, hear). He would illustrate his meaning by a case. He had a right, as an individual, to say, "I live in a certain street, and I will not employ a single tradesman in that street"; but he should have no right to come down to that House and say to every noble Lord in it, "Let us agree not to deal with a single tradesman in that particular street"; for that would be a con-

spiracy, and all who joined in it would be liable to be punished for a conspiracy. He hoped their lordships would not allow those meetings. He solemnly declared it to be his opinion, and he considered, from the high judicial station which he had had the honour of holding, he would not be justifiable in withholding that opinion, that such meetings were illegal, and, if not opposed, would be attended with mischief.

The LORD CHANCELLOR thought that, considering the high office which he had the honour of holding, of highest judge of the kingdom, he would not be discharging his duty if he suffered this conversation to pass without taking some small part in it; feeling, as he did, just as much as any noble lord who then heard him, and just as much as his noble and learned Friend who had just sat down, the great importance of the subject. He entirely agreed with that noble and learned Lord in opinion, that a vast and unnecessary number of men assembling together was illegal. (Hear, hear). If he was wrong in his opinion, he was wrong in common with the highest authorities on the bench and at the bar, to whom he had been able to refer, and every one of whom declared their opinions against the illegality of such proceedings. It was his real and decided opinion; and he hoped that his opinion on this point should be known, as there appeared to be an erroneous impression abroad regarding it, that it was not lawful for men to assemble in vast bodies, in numbers disproportionate to the nature of the occasion for which their meeting was convened, and in multitudes beyond the apparent necessity of the case. (Hear, hear). Such assemblages tended to great public mischief. (Hear, hear). They tended to the intimidation of the peaceable inhabitants of the districts where they were convened; they tended (and that was an important view in a great commercial country like this) to the intimidation and derangement of peaceful industry; and they tended, by bringing forth an innumerable body of people, to endanger the peace of the kingdom, and that for a purpose which was wholly unnecessary.

(Hear, hear). Having said thus much, and hoping that he had not understated what in his opinion was the law on the subject, he could not but add, and he hoped it would be in the recollection of the House, how difficult a thing it was for the Minister filling the high and delicate office now held by his noble Friend opposite, that of Secretary of State for the Home Department, to act in such a case. For the Minister had always to consider this: It being the undoubted privilege of all classes of his Majesty's subjects to meet to deliberate on their affairs, and especially under what they may consider grievances under which they suffer, it was a difficult thing to determine the exact point when they went from what was rightful and proper into what was wrongful, and for which they made themselves amenable to the law. He (the Lord Chancellor) held it to be clear that it was wrong to draw together a vast assemblage of persons, and to make a procession for the purpose of presenting a petition, which could be as well presented by six persons as by sixty thousand persons. He would go no further than that at present in stating his opinion. Let them, however, consider the peculiar situation in which his noble Friend the Secretary for the Home Department was placed on that day week. If there was any case in which he (the Lord Chancellor) would be inclined to strain the law, and not to act harshly towards an assemblage of people, even if they fell within the scope of the law, it was where the object of the meeting was not selfish or personal, or to forward their own views and interests, but where they came forward to petition for mercy in behalf of their unfortunate fellow-countrymen then suffering under the sentence of the law. (Hear, hear). He wished it to be understood that in his (the Lord Chancellor's) opinion, those unfortunate men were lawfully and justly convicted. (Hear, hear). He had not the slightest doubt on the subject; and of other learned judges and lawyers whom he had consulted on it, not one entertained the shadow of a doubt that those men were justly as well as lawfully con-

demned; and that for a very grave offence. It was the foulest, the most unbearable calumny against the learned judge before whom those men were tried, and against the administration of the law, to say—as had been industriously circulated—that they were convicted, and sentenced, and punished, because they were members of the trades' union. Such an assertion was utterly false. (Hear, hear.) No man could be accused or tried for being a member of the trades' union (hear, hear), for then he would be tried for what had been no offence, but in the present instance the men were tried, convicted, and punished for one of the worst of offences. (Hear, hear.) They were convicted of an offence pregnant with great danger, and leading to danger that was still worse; for it might lead to conspiracy (hear, hear), and to a violation of all the rights of property. Nay, it might lead to the most repulsive and inexcusable of crimes from the nature of the offence—that of taking unlawful oaths—for it had a direct tendency to encourage assassination. (Hear, hear.) The crime of which these men were found guilty was that of administering unlawful oaths—an offence which till within the last few years, was unknown in this country; and bad as that offence was, was worse in as far as it led to offences of a deeper die. In vindication of the learned judges who tried these persons, who had been foully and shamefully slandered, but who had manfully done their duty (hear, hear), he felt it his peculiar duty, from the high office which he had the honour of holding as the head of the law, to make this statement in their vindication, and fairly and distinctly to point out for what offence these persons had been tried and convicted. (Hear, hear, hear.) They had, however, got by degrees from the consideration of the procession to which the noble Duke alluded, into a discussion upon trades' unions in general, and on the procession of Monday last, to which the noble Duke's observations did not at all apply. The noble Duke referred to a procession of a far different nature, which took

place at a funeral yesterday. Now he (the Lord Chancellor) was not aware that the law limited the number of persons who were allowed to be present at a funeral. (Hear, hear.) He (the Lord Chancellor) knew that it was said that the funeral was merely got up as a pretence for the assemblage of a number of persons, but whether that was really the case or not he had yet to learn. He confessed that he had heard with feelings of disgust that for the first time ever such a practice was heard of in England, funerals were made the medium of political and trades' agitation (Cheers). But this was a practice so repulsive to the feelings of Englishmen, that he (the Lord Chancellor) had no apprehension of its spreading far and wide. He was sure that those tokens of respect and veneration which the living show to the dead could not be turned, for any length of time, into the medium of political hostility and agitation. He was accordingly at some pains to inquire whether the funeral yesterday (Sunday) was as numerously attended as that of that day fortnight, and he was glad to learn that the numbers had greatly fallen off. (Hear, hear.) He was sure that such would be the result. The good taste and the decent feelings of the English people would not tolerate such an abuse, and in a few weeks this trick—for trick it was—was not likely to answer the objects of its promoters. He spoke thus with the best feelings for the welfare and interests of the people. (Hear, hear.) It was certain that the worst enemies of the trades themselves, and of the labouring classes in general, and their most pernicious counsellors, were those who advised them—now that the repeal of the combination laws made such associations no longer unlawful—to form unions for the purpose of raising wages, but who did not understand the laws which regulated the distribution of wages, nor the effect which such unions would have upon the tradesmen themselves. Such associations must ever have the most baneful effects, and would ever lead to no other result but the laying in of stores of repentance.

He had consulted with his associates and fellow-labourers in obtaining the repeal of the combination laws on this subject, and he was sure that he never gave more wholesome advice to the working classes than now, when he entreated them to abandon those leaders who, for selfish motives, drew them into those combinations; when he entreated them to come back to that conduct which their own good sense would point out to them as right, and when he called on them not to so subscribe their money—the hard-wrung pittance of their labour and industry; to support idle and good-for-nothing agitators, who pretended to lead them against their masters, but who really led them to act against themselves (hear, hear), and whose only objects were the mean and paltry gains which they wrung from the people by this mean and paltry agitation. (Cheers). With regard to the observations of the noble Earl (Lord Londonderry) and he would say this without meaning any breach of the truce between them, he was totally mistaken. He believed that he could not express more strongly how wrong he was then, when he said that the noble Earl was never more mistaken in his life. (A laugh). The noble Earl said that the trades' unions were the result of the political unions. Now that could scarcely be, for the trades' unions were of six years longer standing than the political unions (hear, hear); and it might be in the recollection of the noble Earl, and of their lordships, that one of the first things to which the attention of the present Government was called on their taking office in 1830, was the mischiefs and danger to be apprehended from trades' unions. (Hear, hear). And it would be some justification to the present Government, when he stated to their lordships that the conduct of the trades' unions, previous to the period when the Government came into office, was infinitely worse than any thing that could be attributed to them or ever credited of them at the present moment. (Hear, hear, hear). There was no doubt, from the test of experience, that the unions could

be defeated in every case where the masters firmly discharged their duty to themselves, and he would say, to their men; for in opposing these unions, masters did a kindness to the men themselves. (Hear, hear). There was only one case in which a master acting contrary to those principles, chose to give in, instead of opposing them; but in all other cases, the wrong-doers met with their own reward, being discomfited. He was glad to have this opportunity of making this statement of his opinions, having received several communications from persons who said, that whatever the opinions of other persons might be, he could not be an enemy to trades' unions. He (the Lord Chancellor) declared that he was an enemy to them, simply and solely because they were detrimental to the community at large; and because they were even worse for the members of the unions themselves than for any other class of the community. (Hear, hear).

The Marquis of LONDONDERRY said a few words in explanation, which were inaudible. His opinion was, that those assemblages could not be put down, if steps were not taken to put them down by force.

The Duke of NEWCASTLE thought that such funerals on Sundays ought to be put down, as they created a disturbance upon the Sabbath. He then presented a petition from the Graduates and Under-Graduates of St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge, against the concessions to the Dissenters. The petitioners rejected the doctrines of those who supported the extension of the privileges of the London University, which they designated a mere public school, lately established.

RURAL WAR.

(From the Morning Chronicle, 28. April.)

AGRICULTURAL RIOT.—On Saturday night an alarming riot took place among the agricultural labourers of Bourne. For a long time past the system of sending the surplus labourers on the roads has been adopted at prices equal to their earnings when working for the farmer. A few hours' useless employ-

ment begat idleness, and ultimately but few could be found who would not prefer loitering on the road to more reputable employment in the field. The parish allowance was then reduced from 8s. to 6s.; upon which the labourers declared open war; and having been joined by all the poachers and loose characters in the vicinity, commenced a furious attack on the Bull Inn, where the overseer of the poor then was. Many of them were armed with guns; and there being no adequate civil power at hand, their demands were complied with. A meeting of magistrates has since taken place.—*Lincolnshire Chronicle*.

INCENDIARISM.—About twelve o'clock on Sunday night a destructive fire broke out in the homestead of the Rev. Mr. Goodman, of Oare, Devizes. Two large barns, a cart house, two straw houses, a quantity of hay, stable, three valuable horses, twenty-four pigs, and a quantity of poultry, were destroyed. The loss amounts to 1,500*l*.—On Tuesday night another fire broke out on the premises of Mr. R. Hayward, at Churton, about five miles from Devizes, which destroyed seven labourers' cottages, a dwelling-house, three barns, a stable, a cart-house, six horses, some pigs, fowls, and husbandry implements.

(From the *Morning Chronicle*, 28 April, 1834.)

POLITICAL writers of late have generally expressed themselves doubtful as to the soundness of the theory formerly assumed to be that of the constitution of this country. It has been said, that we never have had a House of Peers and a House of Commons independent of each other. The problem remains to be solved—and may be solved during the session—how far and how long a representative and a hereditary legislative body can “work together.” Rumours have been rife during the last few days that the Tory peers have resolved to crush all the pending liberal measures of legislation, and to make “a dead set” at the administration. No one doubts that the conservative lords have the power and the will, if they

have the temerity—and can “screw their courage to the sticking place”—to accomplish this reported design; and few can doubt, except their lordships, of its ultimate and signal failure. The blind aristocracy of Europe will never see their real interest till the hour of dissolution. They think that they can arrest the wheels of time—that with the old weapons of ignorance they can defeat the growing power of knowledge—that they can not only prevent the progress of liberal opinions, but also root up the trees of liberty planted throughout Europe. The legitimate monarchs of Europe have their active partisans in England, and the formation of a Tory cabinet in this country is the great present design of that asylum for the blind—the Holy Alliance. The commencement of this new crusade of the Tory peers, it is said, will be their fatal opposition to the “Election Purification Bills.” If the Conservatives cannot “un-reform” the House of Commons, they will, at least, endeavour to prevent its further reformation. Thus the bills for the real enfranchisement of Warwick, Liverpool, and Hertford, are the particular objects of demolition in the House of Lords. Whether the victims are to be indulged with the comparative blessings of an instant death, or to be condemned to a lingering torture and the rack of mock inquiry, appears doubtful; but that the bills are condemned, at least by the fulminations of the Tory peers and Conservative clubs, is notorious. Although we doubt not the ardent hopes and desires of the enemies of reform, we cannot believe that the more moderate and sensible Tory peers will sanction such an insult to the reformed House of Commons, or such an outrage on public opinion. Lord Harrowby and Lord Wharncliffe have but recently affected to entertain moderate opinions, and to be eminently desirous of preventing the disunion and collision of the two branches of the legislature. Are they about to repeat the singular tactics they displayed during the critical discussion of the Reform Bills? And are these two wavering peers to be again the fulcrum

of the most obnoxious conduct of the Tory lords? If so, these two bold and eminently moderate peers will imitate the mediators in an Irish row, whose well-known province it is to inflame the hostile clans, that by an increased activity of strife the termination of the contest may be more speedy and decisive. And what are the measures which the Conservative peers are thus suspected of intending to "cast out"? The Bill "for preventing Bribery and Corruption and illegal practices in the election of Members to serve in Parliament for the Borough of Warwick," is founded on the most indisputable evidence of the basest and most varied election infamies on the records of Parliament. The accused and convicted parties offered no defence. The grave and long-protracted inquiries of Commons' Committees have justified a bill for annexing the town of Leamington to the borough of Warwick, thus giving to the oppressed and demoralized electors of the latter place the means of an independent and honest exercise of their elective franchise. The bill passed the House of Commons in all its stages without a division. Is this a measure which the Lords will this day be bold and insane enough to reject, not only in defiance of the House of Commons, but without even the decent forms of preliminary inquiry? And if they pause before they thus expose themselves to the country, will they execute their rumoured intention of "voting out" on the second reading the Bill "to exclude the freemen of Liverpool from voting at the election of Members of Parliament for that Borough"? If they object to pass the Warwick Bill without evidence before their own tribunal, as they have already announced, will they really cast out the Liverpool bill without any investigation of its merits? The extraordinary doctrine of the Tory peers is, that in their judicial capacity they must inquire for themselves; and that the judicial inquiries of the Commons ought to have no weight or influence with their Lordships. Will they, nevertheless, assume that the Commons' evidence in the case of

Warwick *does* necessitate an inquiry at the bar of the upper House, and in the same breath, the same evening, contend that the Commons' evidence does *not* justify the Liverpool bill; that is to say, in the one case adopt the evidence before the Commons, and in the other case repudiate its application? If the peers thus portray themselves to the country, they will have no justification—not even the shadow of an apology. The election purification bills are not cabinet measures. No party manoeuvre to outvote Ministers can extenuate or explain such an outrageous and disgraceful course of legislative procedure. It will be a cold and malignant act of hostility to all reform. A collision between the two Houses of Lords and Commons will be inevitable, and immediately consequential on their lordships' suicidal vote. A reformed House of Commons could never brook such an insult to its character and natural right to deal with the representation of the people. The suspended writs would of course be continued in their present abeyance; and the House of Commons would immediately come to some signal vote of recorded opinion on the hostile and unconstitutional acts of the peers. Will the Lords invite such a conflict? Have they ever at any period of British history gained by such a collision? And in such times and on such an occasion are they more likely to reap any benefit from such a critical and senseless opposition to the representative power of the nation? When the time shall arrive that the elective and hereditary branches of the legislature cannot act together, which of them will eventually give place to the other? The country will look to the result of the debate in the Lords this evening with intense interest as the opening of their Lordships' campaign and the demonstration of their sessional tactics.

SIR,—In your *Register* of the 8. of March last, you were pleased to speak favourably of an article upon railways, which appeared in a work edited by

myself, "The Journal of Steam Transport and Husbandry." From this circumstance, and the interest you have always taken to promote the social improvement of the nation, I am led to address you upon a subject which I hope will recommend itself to your support. I believe that it will be allowed that the grand evils of our condition are, *excess of labour, dear food, and accumulation of capital* in the hands of individuals. The *proposal* which I submit in the enclosed pamphlet, if adopted, will practically remedy these evils, and that by a way that will protect our agricultural interest, and benefit the community at large. At a moment then of such exigent distress, when something must be done to afford relief, I am most desirous that some honourable independent member, the friend of his country, and his fellow men, would bring this subject before the attention of Parliament. I have for this purpose addressed myself to a great number of those members who have more prominently distinguished themselves by their exertions to promote the common good. But of that number there is none whose services in the cause would be so effective or valuable as your own. Let me beg, therefore, that you will not allow so favourable an opportunity as that which will be presented by Mr. Wallace's motion upon Tuesday next, to pass without calling the attention of the House to this subject. I have laid a petition before Earl Grey, praying that a commission to inquire into it may be granted, or should that be refused, that the committee to inquire into the state of the Post-office may also embrace the subject of roads and locomotive conveyance. To this petition I have had no reply, but Mr. Wallace has told me that his motion is quite broad enough to admit of this enlarged inquiry, provided it is urged.

But independent of the merits of the *proposal*, there are other reasons, and I think very weighty ones, why the opportunity of Mr. Wallace's motion should be embraced to bring the subject of steam-carriages before the attention of Parliament. 1st. The daily press has stifled

every attempt to enlighten the public mind on the subject of railways. The *sacra fames* of pocketing a few pounds for railway advertisements, has been too powerful to permit it to do its duty by the country of laying bare the truth that railways will never answer as a mercantile speculation. It is necessary, therefore, that the public should be put upon their guard upon this point by those who are the representative guardians of the public. 2nd. Two committees are sitting daily upon the projected Great Western and Southampton Railway Bills: whatever may be the fate of those bills, it would be well for the members who form the committees, to be informed *in the House*, what, in all probability, will not transpire *before them in evidence*, that the Liverpool and Manchester railway (which makes more than one half of its annual returns by the *carriage of passengers*, which were never contemplated to be carried when it was constructed) has not *paid one per cent. net profit*, and that in sanctioning any future bills it must be, with *this fact* before them, and also that the introduction of steam-carriages upon granite tramways will *entirely monopolise the traffic in passengers*. 3rd. The Birmingham railway is commenced, and already the cuttings and excavations made for many miles; ought not the legislature still to arrest this unnecessary undertaking? Were it the mere waste of capital, little might be said; if speculators choose to pay 3 or 4,000,000*l.* for their whistle, they are welcome; but the destruction of soil, the cutting up the face of the country, ought not to be permitted. A tramway to Birmingham can be laid down for 300,000*l.*; why then form a railway which will cost at the same average per mile as the Manchester one, 4,684,295*l.* Competition cannot exist between these modes of transport, and the arm of Government ought to be put forth to avert a work which it is the height of madness to proceed with. 4th. "The London, Holyhead, and Liverpool steam-coach and road company" have given notice for intended application to Parliament for power to

make a tramway between London and Birmingham; if Ministers oppose Mr. Wallace's motion, it will be a fitting opportunity to ask how the mails are to be conveyed under a change of system that will throw each line of road into the hands of a private company.

As Mr. Cort's valuable paper is in your hands, I shall not trespass further upon your attention by going into any statements in support of the above positions. I trust that the reasons adduced in my own pamphlet for a Government consolidation of roads, correspondence, and conveyance, will induce you to take up the subject. I know that the proposal is new, and against the grain of our idol, viz. *national enterprise*.

But the time is fast coming when Ministers will have to find other funds for carrying on the affairs of the state, than those wrung from our impoverished tax-payers. The adoption of this proposal will provide these funds, and provide them in a way that may better the condition of every family in the land. Hoping that on the 29. you will bring forward the subject during the course of the debate.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

R. BROWN.

25. April, 2, Wigmore-street.

Mr. Cobbett, M.P.

AGRICULTURAL DISTRESS AND EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT.

NORTHFIELD PETITION.

At a meeting held at the Bell, Northfield, on Wednesday, the 16. of April, 1834, Mr. Green in the Chair, the following petition, moved by Mr. Wright, and seconded by Mr. Greeves, was unanimously adopted, and ordered to be sent to the members for the Eastern Division of the county of Worcester, with a request that they would support it:

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great

Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of the owners and occupiers of land, in the parishes of Northfield and King's Norton,

Sheweth, That the agricultural interest of the whole country has long been greatly depressed; that the capital of the farmers has for a long time been wasting; that rents, in many instances, have long been paid out of capital; and the productive power of the land greatly diminished.

That your petitioners have already stated these facts to your honourable House, but hitherto without effect. Your petitioners beg leave once more earnestly to call the attention of your honourable House to their deplorable situation, and to the report of the Committee on Agriculture made in the year 1821. That report admits that the agricultural interest was then labouring under great and trying difficulties, but expressed a hope (the grounds of which hope are stated in the report) that the great body of the occupiers of the soil would be able to surmount those difficulties. The report of the Committee on Agriculture made last year, admits that the hope held out by the former committee had proved unfounded; that the difficulties remained unchanged; and that the resources to which that committee had looked for the realization of their hopes, were all exhausted. Yet, after this admission, to the great surprise and grief of your petitioners, the committee of last year concludes its report by stating, that the hopes which remained to the agriculturist rest rather on cautious forbearance than on the active interposition of Parliament; or, in other words, that there is no hope, and that Parliament can do nothing.

Your petitioners are unwilling to give themselves up to that despair which such a report naturally generates, and humbly beg leave to state that, to them, the cause of their distress is quite apparent, and that your honourable House has the power, had it the will, to remove that cause. A constant and continuous fall in the price of agricultural produce, un-

accompanied by any diminution of the burdens on land, is the real cause of all their difficulties; that in many instances a sacrifice of the whole rent will not compensate for that fall; that the fall of price is clearly to be traced to an alteration in the circulating medium, occasioned by a bill passed in the year 1819, commonly called Peel's Bill. That your petitioners are confirmed in this view of the case by the fact, that immediately after the restoration of peace, measures preparatory to the alteration in the currency were adopted, which measures produced a ruinous fall of price; that when the bill passed this evil greatly increased, and in the year 1821 was so intolerable and alarming that Parliament was compelled to postpone the full operation of the bill, and to adopt measures which virtually repealed it. While the bill was thus suspended, the agricultural interest revived. In the year 1826 the bill was again brought into full and accelerated operation; distress again returned, has ever since constantly increased, and has now arrived at that point, which if not speedily removed, must effect the ruin of the whole landed interest, landlords and tenants, and involve in one common ruin all classes, and end in the destruction of the social compact. Your petitioners beg leave also to say, that the two committees were strictly enjoined *not to inquire into the effect of the bill called Mr. Peel's Bill; that no inquiry into the justice or practicability of the enactments of that bill has yet been made*; the only inquiry ever instituted relative to that measure having been limited to the time and manner of effecting the object intended. Your petitioners feel convinced that, if an inquiry is granted, the injustice and impracticability of the measure can easily be proved, and that, dreadful as its effects have been, they are trifling when compared with the inevitable consequences of persisting in it; and they are satisfied that no effectual remedy for their distress can be found while that bill remains in force; and they venture to predict, that the alleged prosperity of manufactures and commerce cannot be permanent, while a measure so unjust in

itself, and so ruinous in its consequences, remains unrepealed.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your honourable House will be pleased to institute an immediate inquiry *into the effects of this bill*, and to adopt such measures as shall, by doing *equal justice to creditor and debtor*, place their mutual prosperity on a sure and solid foundation, and restore to your petitioners that fair reward for their labour of which they have been so long most unjustly and cruelly deprived.

And your petitioners will ever pray,
&c. &c.

WORCESTER PETITION.

At a meeting held at the Crown Inn, Worcester, on Wednesday, 9. April, 1834, the Earl of Coventry in the Chair, the following petition, moved by Sir A. Lechmere, and seconded by the Earl of Beauchamp, was unanimously adopted:

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned owners and occupiers of land in the county of Worcester,

Showeth,—That your petitioners are suffering under rapidly increasing difficulties, and that ruin will speedily ensue, unless the burdens which they bear are removed, or their means of meeting them be increased; they appeal to your honourable House, with a firm reliance that you will take their situation into immediate consideration, and afford them that relief to which they feel themselves entitled. Your petitioners beg permission respectfully to state the grievances under which they labour, and humbly to represent to your honourable House, that the present prices of agricultural produce are so utterly inadequate, that the following evils are daily increasing, which, if not stayed, will terminate in the destruction of your petitioners:

First. A total inability to pay the taxes, rates, charges, labour, and rent,

from the produce of the land; the farmer making up the deficiency by the sacrifice of his capital; and his means of employing labour and cultivating the land to the best advantage, being thereby diminished.

Secondly. A consequent increase of the poor-rates.

Thirdly. A throwing out of cultivation of all lands, except those of the best quality, and in good situations.

Fourthly. An entire loss of income to the owners of second-rate and inferior soils; the surrendering up such lands, in a great many instances to mortgagees; and the complete ruin of the farmers, labourers, and artisans, dependent upon, and heretofore maintained by, such lands.

Fifthly. The non-existence of an adequate provision for the poor of Ireland: the consequent influx of Irish produce at ruinously low prices; and numbers of Irish labourers being driven for subsistence to this country.

We would humbly express our firm conviction, that the removal of the present, though inadequate protection of the corn laws, would accelerate our destruction.

Your petitioners beg also to state, that the evils under which they are suffering are mainly to be attributed to the alteration of the currency produced by the bill of 1819.

Your petitioners, therefore, earnestly request that your honourable House will institute an immediate inquiry into the effects of that measure, and into the necessity of making such alterations as shall, while faith is preserved between debtor and creditor, firmly establish general prosperity, and restore to your petitioners that fair reward for their labour of which they have long and cruelly been deprived.

We, therefore, humbly pray your honourable House to adopt such measures as may be calculated to realize remunerating prices, and thereby enable us to discharge the public and local burdens imposed on the owners and cultivators of land, to pay fair rents, to employ labour, and beneficially to cultivate the land, and promote general prosperity.

Among the persons present at the above meeting were, the Earls of Coventry and Beauchamp, Hon. W. Coventry, Hon. H. B. Lygon, M. P., Sir Anthony Lechmere, Sir Thomas Phillips, Sir Osley Wakeman, Mr. Hodgetts Foley, M. P., Capt. Winnington, M. P., Mr. Cookes, M. P., Mr. Robinson, M. P., Colonel Charlette, and many of the leading landowners and farmers in the county.

CURSE OF PAPER-MONEY.

(From the *Halifax (Nova Scotia) Recorder*, 22. March, 1834).

Mr. HOLLAND: Sir,—There has been so much said and written on the subject and object of those meetings of the inhabitants of this town, which took place awhile back, that perhaps the reverting to them at this late period may be considered stale matter for discussion. With some it may; but I am of a different opinion, and think I can plainly show they have tended to injure rather than benefit the community. It was obvious from the crowded state of the room on the first instance, that no common interest and feeling attracted so large a congregation; from the anxious faces apparent on that day, there was sufficient evidence that *four-fifths* of that assembly met under the supposition that something was to be done to relieve them as far as possible from present difficulties. It was, in point of fact, a meeting of *debtors* to ascertain the best method of satisfying a clamorous creditor. And how did the farce go off? Not by an open confession to that creditor of inability to pay; not by a statement of facts, that the principal sums due to him were clear profit made, and deducted from our labours for the last nine years, and under such specious forms of *accommodation*, that we debtors were not aware of it until called upon to pay. Not by an open confession, that a veil of deception or delusion had been drawn across the organs of perception for nine years, during which period our substance has been withdrawn little by little, and ourselves plunged into enormous difficulties and

debt: not by an open exposure of these truths, and a firm demand upon the authors of those evils to assist in leading us out of trouble, as they have been the undoubted cause and instruments of leading us into it. Who, I would ask, has more right to support this falling community, than the men who have, according to every man's opinion, been the cause of its troubles? Who, I would ask, are *able* to save it but those who have grown too powerful and rich by its united labours? But how did the farce go off? for farce it was in spite of the attempt of the agent of the Halifax Banking Company to affix the cause of *all* our troubles upon the smuggling trade carried on at the village of Windsor. Mr. Williamson's motion on account of having the words *cash payments* was carried unanimously—an *immediate return*, &c., a committee was nominated to wait on each bank to ask the sage question, Why do you not discount my notes? If they had been at a loss for an answer, the meeting of whom these questioners were the delegates, had put one into their mouths. They only feared the event before, now they were sure of it. Did they, could they, expect any other answer than they obtained? Did they expect the bankers would say, Oh, you have determined that we should respond in cash: being made sure of this, we will now discount all your paper, but not being sure but that things were to remain on their old footing, we were delicate in issuing to any extent: oh, yes, we will now discount for you. Will any man in his senses say that such an answer would be expected? If not why were the questions proposed? I should imagine that the fact of their not discounting was pretty well known without inquiry in such a formal manner. I should like much to know then, what they were sent for? It is a question hard to be answered, but a meeting of such respectability could not dissolve without a show of something, and a sham fight was thought to be better than no fight at all. Admitted that it is difficult to imagine the objects expected to result from that deputation's visit to the banks—I may

be allowed to give an opinion as to what should have been the messages from the meeting to be delivered to the bankers through their deputation: 1st, We have called upon you to say, that an advertisement appeared nine years ago, offering us the benefit of a bank, which we accepted; and we have given it a long trial; its results have been the ruin of many, and is likely to ruin all. We are aware that we are indebted largely to your establishments, and we are come to make such arrangements as circumstances will admit as to payments. 2nd, We demand — months for the liquidation of the whole of your demands, to be subdivided in four equal parts, the first instalment to be paid on the first of June next. 3rd, We lastly pray and beseech that you will not on any account issue now or hereafter any notes, commonly termed bank notes, as we have found by dear-bought experience, that they are pernicious to our true interests; and further, we are anxious and feel determined to get back, if possible, into the good old system of safety, when every man could say,—I am my own banker. Had this been the language of the people to the banks, an understanding would have mutually existed, and the good effects would have at once appeared. Hundreds, who must now fall, and through sacrifice of property perhaps pay 5s. in the pound, who would under such arrangement be enabled to pay the banks and every man his due, besides saving his family and himself from irreparable ruin. Mark the results of the meeting, Mr. Williamson's resolution was taken as the basis; a petition got up to the House of Assembly, and instead of a law for an *immediate return* (according to the spirit of the resolution) to cash payments, the *poor* bankers obtained a period of five months—to do what? To pay their debts. In the mean time what are they doing with us? Draining us to the very dregs; turning the *screw* until we burst asunder one after the other, and from present appearances by the eventful 1. of June, there will be but few left upon whom the *screws* can be applied with any ef-

fect. That extension of time is the finishing stroke, if one was required, as the bankers make good use of it, as they do of all other advantages. It is an excuse for their present proceedings. They pretend that a *rush* will be made for specie; were they asked from whence expected, they could not answer. This excuse like all others will do for want of a better; but is this the real cause of their pressing us? If it is, it certainly is a fair confession of having signed more notes (as many of us have done) than they can pay. But I am inclined to think that this is not the cause, I am afraid there is something more serious under the veil: in all our troubles, as yet, real estate has not been brought to the hammer—according to present proceedings, should not the people take the alarm in time to prevent a general destruction of this description of property? Real estate has already depreciated at least one third within the last six months, are we not to presume from the gradual and certain advances making upon us by the banks, that they aim at our *castles*? Two years ago I owned a property valued at 1,000*l.*, and to gratify an itching for speculation, obtained from the ——— a sum of 250*l.* upon it by giving a mortgage, the banks are winding me up, and the end will be an assignment for the benefit of my creditors, my house must be sold, and my good friend the ——— will be the purchasers, who else can find the cash. He is a banker and has it all to himself. This will not occur to me alone, for there are hundreds of similar cases, and unless something is done, we shall see before the 1. of June, if the system is not brought into complete operation. The only remedy is in our own hands, if we do not make use of it, we must not only take the inevitable consequence. It may be asked why are the people so patient? It is indeed a matter of astonishment, and I am sorry to think it proceeds from either pride, or a want of independent spirit. We are either too proud to confess debts we are unable to pay at the moment, or lack in that true spirit of independence which if brought

into proper operation by the people, must ever teach those who hold the rod to use it with proper discretion, or risk the event of its returning upon their own backs with double force. Some may say, the bankers themselves will eventually lose; this I deny, and will endeavour at a future day to show how certain they are under every circumstance, of getting their debts to the utmost farthing. Your obliged and obedient servant,

ONE OF THE PEOPLE.

LORD'S DAY BILL.

*No. 1, Hanover-place, Brighton,
April 26, 1834.*

SIR,—I have the honour to address you, respecting a petition having been presented to “the House of Commons” by Mr. J. N. Wigney, member for this borough, from the bakers; the purport of which I understand to be “For the better observance of the Lord's Day”; the true meaning is, that they should be exempt from baking meat, pies, puddings, &c., on that day. Some years since they obtained an act to save their fetching dinners, &c., or sending their home on that day, and that all bakings should be sent before eleven o'clock, and taken away from the bakehouse by half-past one; this, I believe, is very strictly observed by both parties. Now, sir, permit me to give you my opinion upon this subject, and I shall begin by telling you that the population of this borough exceeds 40,000; of these not less than 10,000 have baked dinners on Sunday; the only day in seven which the major part of them enjoy a piece of meat and a hot joint with potatoes. Supposing that 200 bakers take in 50 bakings each, some do more, and each family of five persons, these 200 would allow 10,000 persons to go to church, chapel, &c., by many of whom it might be inconvenient to pay for fuel to cook with; for one penny the dinner is baked, and

perhaps, with what may be left, enough is provided for two or three days with a potato. How stands it with the baker's occupation? Then, I will tell you, as far as I know practically (and ask any one experienced in this line of business, I think he will say that I am nearly correct in my statement) as follows: the baker lights his oven at nine or half-past, and he has to attend to it until near eleven, when it is swept out and laid down, for a few minutes, to equalize the heat. He begins to set in the dinners at eleven, his work is so far done, by a quarter, or twenty minutes after they are all in. He has occasionally to attend to the turning and shifting them, in the oven. At one he begins to draw; and, by a quarter after, the whole are out, and ready to be delivered to his customers: then all he has got to do is, to deliver them to their rightful owners, take the money, and shut his oven for the day. Be it observed that only one person can attend the oven, at the same time all the family may go to church or chapel for the morning service, and leave the baker only at home. He has plenty of time for his dinner, to clean, and dress himself; and also can have the benefit of the afternoon and evening prayers and lectures, whilst, by his three hours' labour, he has enabled 50 families to go in the morning. There are generally two in a bakery; they might take alternate Sundays. Many of these would-be-better-than-good people, whose names are signed to the petition "For the better observance of the Sabbath," have been very unfortunate in having their bread weights and measures seized by the inspectors,* and fined. They now wish to expiate for their offences, and become followers of Saint Sir Andrew Agnew, who, from my knowledge of them, are a set of canting, whining, praying, psalm-singing, scripture-expounding, devil-dodging, Christ-beseeching, heavenly fortune-telling humbugs.

The whole of their petition is wrapped

up in cant, sheer cant, and nothing but cant.

I remain, Sir,
With health and respect,
Yours,
JOHN SMITH,

A constant reader of "The Political Register" for more than twenty years, and a particular friend of that honest and celebrated citizen, Thomas Paine.

To Mr. Cobbett, M. P.

"P. S. If the bakers' bill passes into a law, at least five millions of persons in England will go without a hot dinner on Sunday, the only day they get one. Glory! Glory!! for the saints!"

From the LONDON GAZETTE,

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1834.

INSOLVENT.

STEVENS, W., jun., Old Jewry, auctioneer.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

DALY, P., Liverpool, bricklayer.

BANKRUPTS.

ALLSOP, J., Belper, Derbysh., wheelwright.
BUTTERWORTH, B. and R., Rochdale, Lancashire, cotton-spinners.

DOUGLAS, D., Whitechapel-road, baker.

GREEN, J. H., Finch-lane, bill-broker.

HANSOM, J., and E. Welch, Birmingham, builders.

HARRIS, G., Broad-street, corn-factor.

HOCKNELL, G., Stone, Staffordshire, inn-keeper.

LEWER, W., Wellington-st., Strand, news-agent.

ROBINSON, J., Bridge-street, Westminster, boot-maker.

WATSON, W., Bringrown, Flintshire, timber-merchant.

WEST, R. A., Leeds, draper.

WYATT, C., Banbury, Oxfordshire, inn-keeper.

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1834.

INSOLVENT.

GREEN, J., Cheltenham, draper.

BANKRUPTCY ANNULLED.

SWALES, W., Great Portland-street, Oxford-street, mercer.

BANKRUPTS.

ARKELL, J., Cheltenham, miller.

* Short weights and measures.

AUGHTIE, J. W., Cheapside, jeweller.
 BRIDGE, W., sen., Manchester, timber-dealer.
 BUGLER, R., Clutton, Somersetshire, inn-keeper.
 GORE, H., Liverpool, merchant.
 OAKLEY, R., Shrewsbury, Shropsh., builder.
 PRINCE, J., Bath, innkeeper.
 SCRIVENER, T., Mark-lane, and High-street, Wapping, corn-dealer.
 SNUGGS, W., Vauxhall, builder.
 THOMPSON, G. T., Bishopsgate - street, dealer in snuff.
 WEAVER, T., South-st., Spitalfields, cheese-monger.
 WILSON, J., Liverpool, upholsterer.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATION.

DONALDSON, R., Pulteneytown, Caithness-shire, merchant.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, April 28.—The supplies of Wheat from Essex to this morning's market were liberal, but moderate from Kent and Suffolk; millers still exhibiting a reluctance to purchase, caused the trade to rule extremely heavy, and though the finest samples sustained no alteration in their previous currency, yet all other qualities were neglected, though they might have been purchased at a decline of fully 1s. per qr. In bonded Wheat we heard of no transactions.

The refreshing showers which were experienced last night and early this morning have damped the speculative spirit which was arising in favour of spring corn, and rendered trade, particularly in Oats, much less animated than last week. Malting qualities of Barley, however, being scarce, and meeting a partial inquiry, supported the rates of this day se'nnight. In distillery and grinding sorts no alteration, and the demand limited.

Malt continues difficult of disposal, and secondary qualities quite nominal in value.

The supply of Oats was again very small, and as dealers refrain from purchasing as much as possible, a slow sale was experienced for the article at worse prices than Wednesday, but equal to last Monday's rates.

Beans were scarce, and 1s. dearer.

White Peas steady in value, and few samples offering. Grey and Maple both advanced 1s. per qr.

The Flour trade was dull. Ship marks supported last week's improvement, but less disposition was shown to purchase at the advance.

Wheat.....	45s. to 57s.
Rye.....	—s. to —s.
Barley.....	22s. to 24s.
— fine.....	28s. to 30s.
Peas, White.....	—s. to —s.
— Boilers.....	32s. to 37s.

— Grey.....	30s. to 33s.
Beans, Small.....	31s. to 37s.
— Tick.....	26s. to 33s.
Oats, Potato.....	21s. to 23s.
— Feed.....	16s. to 19s.
Flour, per sack.....	43s. to 46s.

PROVISIONS.

Pork, India, new....	95s. to 100s.
— Mess, new ...	50s. to 55s. per barl.
Butter, Belfast ...	66s. to 70s. per cwt.
— Carlow	50s. to 70s.
— Cork	—s. to 62s.
— Limerick ..	—s. to 62s.
— Waterford..	50s. to 70s.
— Dublin	44s. to 46s.

SMITHFIELD, April 28.

This day's supply of Beasts, Sheep, Lambs, and Calves, was moderately good, both as to numbers and quality; its supply of Porkers but limited. Trade was, throughout, dull.—With Lamb, at a depression of from 2d. to 4d. per stone; with Beef, Mutton, Veal, and Pork, at Friday's quotations.

A full moiety of the beasts were Scots; the remainder about equal numbers of short-horns, Devons, and Welsh runts, with about 100 Herefords, as many Irish, and about fifty Sussex beasts, as many Town's-end Cows, a few Staffords, &c.

About a third of the Sheep were South-Downs; about the same number new Leicesters, of the South-Down and white-faced crosses, in about the proportion of two of the former to five of the latter; and the remaining third about equal numbers of old Leicesters, horned and polled, Norfolk, Kents, and Kentish half-breds, with a few pens of black-faced Berkshire Sheep; horned Dorsets and Somersets, horned and polled Scotch and Welsh sheep, &c.

The Lambs, supposed to be in number about 4,000, appeared to consist of about equal numbers of South-Downs, Dorsets, and new Leicesters, of mixed crosses, with a few pens of Kentish half-breds, &c.

About 1,900 of the beasts, full a moiety of which were Scots, the rest about equal numbers of short-horns, Devons, and Welsh runts, with a few home-breds, &c., were from Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Cambridgeshire; about 100, chiefly short-horns, with a few Devons, runts, Herefords, and Irish beasts, from Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, &c.; about eighty, chiefly Devons, with a few runts, Herefords, and Irish beasts, from our western and midland districts; about 100, chiefly Sussex beasts, with a few Scots, Devons, runts, and Irish beasts, from Kent, Sussex, and Surrey; and most of the remainder, including the Town's-end Cows, from the stall-feeders, &c., near London.

MARK-LANE.—Friday, May 2.

The arrivals this week are moderate, and the prices fully as high as on Monday.

THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent. }	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.
Cons. Ann. }	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	91 $\frac{3}{8}$	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	90 $\frac{3}{8}$	90 $\frac{7}{8}$	90 $\frac{1}{2}$

COBBETT-LIBRARY.

Fourth Edition.

COBBETT'S Spelling-Book.
(Price 2s.)

Containing, besides all the usual matter of such a book, a clear and concise

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

This I have written by way of

A Stepping-Stone to my own Grammar;

such a thing having been frequently suggested to me by Teachers as necessary.

1. ENGLISH GRAMMAR.—Of this work one hundred thousand copies have now been published. This is a duodecimo volume, and the price is 3s. bound in boards.

2. TULL'S HORSE-HOEING HUSBANDRY; or, a Treatise on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation. With an Introduction, by WM. COBBETT. 8vo. Price 15s.

3. THE EMIGRANT'S GUIDE. Just now Published, under this Title, a little Volume, containing Ten Letters, addressed to English Tax-payers. A new edition, with a Postscript, containing an account of the Prices of Houses and Land, recently obtained from America by Mr. Cobbett. Price 2s. 6d. in bds.

4. THE WOODLANDS; or, a Treatise on the preparing of the ground for planting; on the planting, on the cultivating, on the pruning, and on the cutting down, of Forest Trees and Underwoods. Price 14s. bound in boards.

5. YEAR'S RESIDENCE IN AMERICA.—The Price of this book, in good print and on fine paper, is 5s.

6. FRENCH GRAMMAR; or, Plain Instructions for the Learning of French. Price, bound in boards, 5s.

7. COTTAGE ECONOMY.—I wrote this Work professedly for the use of the labouring and middling classes of the English nation. I made myself acquainted with the best and simplest modes of making beer and bread, and these I made it as plain as, I believe, words could make it. Also of the keeping of Cows, Pigs, Bees, and Poultry, matters which I understood as well as any body could, and in all their details. It includes my writing, also on the Straw Plait. A Duodecimo Volume. Price 2s. 6d.

8. MARTENS'S LAW OF NATIONS.—This is the Book which was the foundation of all the knowledge that I have ever possessed relative to public law. The Price is 17s., and the manner of its execution is I think, such as to make it fit for the Library of any Gentleman.

THE SHILLING MAGAZINE.

FOR MAY,

Just out, conducted by the Editor of
COBBETT'S MAGAZINE.

No. I. contains the following original articles.—I. A Colloquial Essay on Modern Literature, by the late Andrew Picken—II. Criminal Characters, by the author of Old Bailey Experience—III. An Island not mentioned by Captain Ross, by Miss Isabell Hill—IV. Shakspeare and his Prefacers—V. The Progress of the Fine Arts in England—VI. To the Reader, by the Editor—VII. The Beggar of Bethnal Green—VIII. Imprisonment for Debt—IX. The Insurrection in Barbadoes—X. The Creation, a Poem—XI. My Clerkship—XII. Calf Love—XIII. A Hackney Coach Adventure, and several poetical articles.

Published at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.

THE ONLY REMAINING LOTTERY.

ON the 22nd JULY next, the Commissioners under the Act 1st and 2nd William IV., Cap. 8, will distribute by lot *all the remaining property, funds, and assets*, of the Glasgow Improvement Company, in 2,036 lots of various amounts and value, at COOPER'S HALL, in the city of London, according to the mode and manner in which the prizes in State Lotteries were formerly drawn. The scheme contains the following capitals, besides smaller Prizes of 800*l.*, 500*l.*, 400*l.*, 300*l.*, 200*l.*, &c. All to be drawn in One Day, the 22nd JULY next:

1.... of....	16,000.....	16,000
1.....	10,000.....	10,000
1.....	3,000.....	3,000
1.....	2,000.....	2,000
1.....	1,600.....	1,600
1.....	1,500.....	1,500
2.....	1,400.....	2,800
1.....	1,100.....	1,100
&c. &c. &c.		

All the Prizes in the Scheme will be paid in money if required, subject only to a commission of five per cent. on those valued above 100*l.*, which is deducted to cover the risk and expense in selling the property. In the First and Second Glasgow Lotteries the Prizes were all sold to the public, and money for each paid on demand as soon as drawn. The Tickets and Shares, divided agreeably to the Act are on sale at all the Offices in Town and Country.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.